



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,693	09/22/2000	James H. Johnson	032028-0311096	1007

909 7590 11/05/2008
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

HELLNER, MARK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3663

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/05/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/667,693

Applicant(s)

JOHNSON ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Hellner

Art Unit

3663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-7 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elmer (4,247,768) in view of Gebert et al (5,298,738).

Elmer et al disclose a device for determining the velocity of vehicles traversing a roadway, the device comprising: a first radiation source (10 of station 1) producing a first beam and arranged at one side of the roadway; a first detector (11 of station 1) arranged at an opposite side of the roadway to receive the first beam from the first radiation source for producing an output signal indicating a presence or absence of the first beam; a second radiation source (10 of station 2) producing a second beam and arranged at one side of the roadway and spaced a predetermined distance (column 2, line 43) from the first radiation source; a second detector (11 of station 2) arranged at an opposite side of the roadway to receive the second beam from the second source for producing a signal indicating the presence or absence of the second beam; means (figure 4) indicating the interruptions of the first and second beams by the front and rear wheels of the vehicle; and analyzing means (figure 3) capable of determining the speed

Art Unit: 3663

and acceleration of the motor vehicle (speed is the scalar value of velocity and acceleration is the derivative of velocity).

The difference between claim 1 and Elmer et al is that the device calculate acceleration.

Gebert et al teach (column 3, line 32) that it was well known at the time of the present application to have used light detection devices of the type disclosed by Elmer et al to measure vehicle acceleration.

It would have been obvious to have measured acceleration in the device of Elmer et al when seeking more detailed information about driver behavior, thus producing claim 1.

Claims 7 and 9 are taught by the combination of Elmer et al and Gebert et al applied to claim 1.

Claim 2 recites components that would have been suggested by elements 12 and 13.

Seventy inches (claim 4) would have been an obvious dimensional variation suggested by the two feet disclosed.

Claims 5 recites notoriously well known properties of IR light sources.

Claim 6 recites notoriously well known detector structure.

Allowable Subject Matter

Art Unit: 3663

Claims 3 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark Hellner at telephone number 571 272 6981.

/Mark Hellner/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3663